



ACADEMIC SENATE

The primary voice of the faculty in academic and professional matters at Santa Rosa Junior College.

AGENDA

September 17, 2025, 3:15 p.m.

Santa Rosa: Senate Chambers,

Doyle Library 145

Petaluma: Room 690, Richard Call Bldg.

ZOOM ID: 958 4627 3808

Click [here](#) to start Zoom

PRESENT M. Anderman, L. Aspinall, A. Atilgan Relyea (remote), S. Avasthi, L. Branen-Ahumada, K. Bunas, J. Bush, J. Davis, K. Fortunati, G. Garcia, V. Hamilton (Petaluma), T. Jacobson, J. Kremer, D. Lemmer, L. D. Lukas, S. McGregor-Gordon, T. Melvin, J. Nieto, M. Ohkubo, N. Perrone (Petaluma), N. Persons, S. Rosen (Petaluma), E. Schmidt, J. Stover, I. Tircuit

ABSENT A. Oliver (proxy: S. McGregor-Gordon), K. Frindell Teuscher (proxy: T. Melvin)

CALL TO ORDER The meeting was called to order by President Stover at 3:15 p.m.

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT The land acknowledgement statement was read by J. Kremer

We acknowledge that we gather at Santa Rosa Junior College on the territorial traditional land of the Pomo People in Santa Rosa and the Coast Miwok People in Petaluma, past and present, and honor with gratitude the land itself and the people who have stewarded it throughout the generations.

OPEN FORUM

1. **M. Anderman:** After rewatching recording of Spring 2025 Senate Study Session on faculty hiring procedure, he realized a comment he made in the Fall Senate retreat this year regarding an interaction he had with President Stover was incorrect. He then provided a correct depiction of interaction and apologized for the misrepresentation. Stated continued advocacy for the right of interview committees to rank their finalists.
2. **K. Kinahan:** Spoke with the support of two faculty colleagues (A. Merkel and R. Wenzel) on faculty's academic freedom including the right to choose and utilize Chancellor approved programs and tools. Stressed importance of current, responsive, and ethical instruction standards that honor academic freedom and reduce unnecessary bureaucracy.
3. **G. Garcia:** Encouraged SRJC to develop a workshop series for students on AI development and its implications, including but not limited to key players and companies, environmental impacts, health risks, consent issues, and shifting economic, political, and socio-economic impacts.
4. **A. Donegan:** Expressed appreciation for Senate discussion on AI and the proposed Canvas tools. Asked if faculty are okay with Silicon Valley corporate leaders making decisions without the input of faculty. Included examples of erroneous AI responses and that AI should not be trusted.
5. **B. Alcantara:** SRJC student and SGA Vice President of Legislation advocated for the right of students to participate in contract faculty search and interview committees. Spoke to the dedication of students and their care for their courses. Asked for students' rights to participate not be denied, and that they be included and counted.

[The full text of all five open forum statements can be viewed here.](#)

MINUTES

Correction/Adoption

President Stover asked the Senate if any amendments and/or corrections were necessary for the draft minutes of the previous meeting.

[Minutes of August 20, 2025.](#) Senator Lukas made a motion to approve the Minutes of August 20, 2025; seconded. Motion passed with 24 yes votes and 3 abstentions.

M. Anderman – yes
L. Aspinall – yes
A. Atilgan Relyea – abstain
S. Avasthi – yes
L. Brannen-Ahumada – yes
K. Bunas – yes
J. Bush – yes
J. Davis – yes
K. Fortunati – yes

K. Frindell Teuscher (proxy) – abstain
G. Garcia – yes
V. Hamilton – yes
T. Jacobson – yes
J. Kremer – yes
D. Lemmer – yes
L. D. Lukas – yes
S. McGregor-Gordon – yes
T. Melvin – yes

J. Nieto – yes
M. Ohkubo – yes
A. Oliver (proxy) – yes
M. Papa – abstain
N. Perrone – yes
N. Persons – yes
S. Rosen – yes
E. Schmidt – yes
I. Tircuit – yes

Minutes of September 3, 2025. Senator Lukas cited a misspelling of her name in the votes listed at the end of the meeting. It was brought forward that faculty member A. Forrester requested the wording describing her Open Forum comment be updated. President Stover delayed the approval of the minutes for the purposes of correcting.

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA Any senator may move any Consent item to the Action agenda to allow for discussion.

Senator Persons requested Discussion Item #2, ***“Shall the Academic Senate fund up to two additional faculty to attend ASCCC Fall 2025 Plenary with President Stover this November?”*** be moved to action due to it being marked urgent; seconded. Motion moved with no opposition to Action agenda (#1).

REPORTS **The President’s Report**

President Stover highlighted the work of the Academic Senate President between Senate meetings and discussed recent challenges; addressed the ongoing recruitment of Contract and Associate faculty members to participatory governance committees, encouraged faculty to participate, and stated the faculty voice will be diminished in governance if all available seats are not filled; and, expressed respect for Senators, [the senate’s 10+1 purview](#), [students’ 9+1 right to participate](#), and encouraged collaboration among constituent groups.

CONSENT Treated collectively as one Action item. Any Senator may move any Consent item to the Action agenda to allow for discussion. None.

ACTION Items must come from the Discussion agenda of a previous meeting or be carried over from a previous Action agenda.

1. **Shall the Academic Senate fund up to two additional faculty to attend ASCCC Fall 2025 Plenary with President Stover this November?** The body approved a similar action [on March 5, 2025](#) for the [Spring 25 Plenary](#).

A Senator requested an update on the current budget. President Stover shared that since last promotional effort, donations increased between \$5 and \$15 a month, and the current Exchange Bank account balance can support the item. Motion to approve made by Senator Lemmer; seconded. Motion passed with 26 yes votes and 1 no vote.

M. Anderman – yes
L. Aspinall – yes
A. Atilgan Relyea – yes
S. Avasthi – yes
L. Brannen-Ahumada – yes
K. Bunas – yes
J. Bush – yes
J. Davis – yes
K. Fortunati – yes

K. Frindell Teuscher (proxy) – abstain
G. Garcia – yes
V. Hamilton – yes
T. Jacobson – yes
J. Kremer – yes
D. Lemmer – yes
L. D. Lukas – yes
S. McGregor-Gordon – no
T. Melvin – yes

J. Nieto – yes
M. Ohkubo – yes
A. Oliver (proxy) – yes
M. Papa – abstain
N. Perrone – yes
N. Persons – yes
S. Rosen – yes
E. Schmidt – yes
I. Tircuit – yes

2. [Online Teaching Certification](#) (5 min) Does the Academic Senate wish to adopt the recommendations embedded in the [Faculty Online Teaching Certification Work Group Final Report](#) [May 7, 2025] as including:

- Certificate Basics Recommendations 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5.
- Certificate Updates Recommendations 2.1.
- Equivalency and Recertification Recommendations 3.1; 3.2; 3.3
- Maintenance Requirements Recommendations 4.1; 4.2; 4.3; & 4.4
- Recommendations 5.1 & 5.2

Concerns were raised that the recommendations were outside of Senate purview and should be taken up by AFA instead, described areas of concern, and proposed changing what to put forward. Senator Lukas made a motion that the recommendations 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5 be forwarded to the union for consideration, and that 1.1 be considered as a recommendation for training we want available, and not have any language about the requirement, which was seconded.

Senators raised opposition to the motion based on speed with which it was brought forward, the rights of departments to set standards for online teaching, and the 10+1 role of faculty in curriculum and setting standards for teaching, among others.

President Stover asked for the motion in writing, which was not available. After some discussion, Senator Lukas withdrew the motion (which was allowable as it had not been restated by the chair). Senator Lukas made a motion to take recommendations 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5 off the table and send them to AFA for future work, which was seconded and restated by the chair.

Senators raised questions regarding PGI and Flex requirements, associate-related pay concerns, Senate purview and the right to recommend, and the importance of supporting online instruction. Time expired on the issue, and President Stover restated the motion and stated the item would be brought back.

DISCUSSION

1. **Discussion Item – Bylaws Change.** Does the Academic Senate support changes to the [academic Senate bylaws](#) and [as based on this action item](#) which was passed by the Senate on [3 September 2025 \(recording here\)](#) and supported by the faculty in a vote concluded on [12 September 2025](#). The bylaws changes are specific to Article VIII, Section 5 and [can be viewed in this support document](#).

Motion was made to move Discussion Item to Action by Senator Lukas; seconded. Motion passed unanimously with 27 yes votes.

M. Anderman – yes
L. Aspinall – yes
A. Atilgan Relyea – yes
S. Avasthi – yes
L. Brannen-Ahumada – yes
K. Bunas – yes
J. Bush – yes
J. Davis – yes
K. Fortunati – yes
K. Frindell Teuscher (proxy) –

yes
G. Garcia – yes
V. Hamilton – yes
T. Jacobson – yes
J. Kremer – yes
D. Lemmer – yes
L. D. Lukas – yes
S. McGregor-Gordon – yes
T. Melvin – yes
J. Nieto – yes

M. Ohkubo – yes
A. Oliver (proxy) – yes
M. Papa – yes
N. Perrone – yes
N. Persons – yes
S. Rosen – yes
E. Schmidt – yes
I. Tircuit – yes

President Stover stated he would update the document to include Associate Senator reassignments.

2. **What recommendations does the Academic Senate have specific to professional development resources and opportunities for Generative Artificial Intelligence educational tools?** *The Senate serves a “rely primarily upon” role in recommending professional development policies.*

A Senator suggested adding GenAI resources that are available on a state level to the current professional development resources in The Vision Resource Center, housed by the Chancellor's office. President Stover informed Senate that he is in the process of scheduling a presentation for the Senate about [The Vision Resource Center](#). Senators suggested having a themed PDA Day for AI, where experts, speakers and workshops could provide a robust catalog of information and education topics; requested additional funding; recommended [Teaching with AI \(Bowen and Watson 2024\)](#) and stated the book provided excellent examples of AI classroom engagement strategies; and also suggested the following professional development topics [\(see also here for stand-alone document\)](#):

- 1. Digital literacy and AI competency**
 - a. Will allow Senate to understand AI's capabilities and limitations as well as appropriate and responsible usage patterns
 - b. Will assist faculty in enhancing student's critical thinking skills and promote integrity in coursework
- 2. AI's impact on specific disciplines worldwide**
 - a. How AI's implementation into software is affecting productive and consumer consumption when applicable
- 3. How to handle students' unethical usage of AI**
 - a. Training in course design
 - b. Classroom choices
- 4. Ethics and AI**
 - a. How AI is used within the classroom
 - b. How AI is discussed with students
- 5. Academic Integrity and Ethics**
 - a. For faculty: Provide clear guidelines on when and how AI is to be utilized for academic work, including proper attribution and disclosure requirements.
 - b. For students: provide an understanding of AI being utilized as a research tool, highlight inappropriate shortcuts; provide a broad view of ethical implications within AI, such as bias towards certain demographics, societal impact of the adoption of AI, and AI's damaging impact on climate change.
- 6. Clear AI usage guidelines**
 - a. Per ongoing student requests to their faculty
- 7. AI: A balanced perspective**
 - a. Identify parameters such as presenting information on how instructors utilize AI; their successes when applicable; and, how faculty can protect themselves from student accusations regarding unproductive AI usage
 - b. Present how AI may and may not be beneficial in all disciplines
- 8. Bias within AI systems**
- 9. AI and its impacts (environmental, health)**
- 10. AI in the Classroom**
 - a. How to instruct students
 - b. Creating assignments that discourage cheating
 - c. Provide students the opportunity to utilize AI appropriately

Senator Persons moved to bring back the topic at the next meeting as an action item in the form of a bulleted list created by Academic Senate Executive Committee members (and) representing the topics discussed to date by Senators on GenAI professional development topics. Motion was seconded and restated by the chair. There was no discussion on the motion, and the vote was taken. The motion passed with 26 yes votes and 1 abstention.

M. Anderman – yes
L. Aspinall – yes
A. Atilgan Relyea – yes
S. Avasthi – yes
L. Brannen-Ahumada – yes
K. Bunas – yes
J. Bush – yes
J. Davis – yes
K. Fortunati – yes

K. Frindell Teuscher
(proxy) – abstain
G. Garcia – yes
V. Hamilton – yes
T. Jacobson – yes
J. Kremer – yes
D. Lemmer – yes
L. D. Lukas – yes
S. McGregor-Gordon –
yes

T. Melvin – yes
J. Nieto – yes
M. Ohkubo – yes
A. Oliver (proxy) – yes
M. Papa – yes
N. Perrone – yes
N. Persons – yes
S. Rosen – yes
E. Schmidt – yes
I. Tircuit – yes

BREAK

3. What recommendations does the Academic Senate have regarding curriculum needs specific to Generative Artificial Intelligence? *The Senate serves a “rely primarily upon” role in recommending curriculum.*

Senators discussed the following: expressed concern about students not developing critical thinking skills due to overutilization of AI; to consider how AI could potentially hinder student learning; discouraged the changing of Course Outlines of Record (CORs) to include AI as this would require the changing of the CORs for all available courses; and recommended integration of AI should be discipline-based and not generalized.

Senators further suggested the following recommendations for curriculum needs related to Generative AI:

- New assessment tools
- Process focused learning and collaborative learning methods for humans and AI
- Ethics/ethical guidelines across all disciplines: cultivate an understanding of the ethical implications of AI, including issues of privacy, bias, and academic integrity
- AI literacy/ General Education AI course
- Discipline-specific AI courses
- Critical thinking and evaluation: develop student’s ability to assess the quality, biases and accuracy of AI generated material.
- How to utilize AI as a tool, and fact check the information it provides
- AI’s limitations
- Prompt engineering, outposts/replies to seek and discard
- Engineering 10 or HLC51: How AI is implemented in specific industries and continuously shifting

President Stover stated topic will be discussed at the next Senate meeting, with Senator Garcia in the queue to speak first.

INFORMATION 4:50 to 5:00 pm (time expired before) [Academic Senate End of Year Report \[AY2024 – 25\] – Board of Trustees Presentation \[10 June 2025\] – J. Stover](#)

ADJOURNMENT President Stover closed meeting at 5:00 p.m.

ALL FACULTY MEMBERS ARE INVITED TO ATTEND ACADEMIC SENATE MEETINGS

This Academic Senate was created to secure the professional rights and to carry out the responsibilities of the faculty of the Sonoma County Junior College District. The faculty have the traditional right of college faculty to participate in the governance of the college. As specialists in specific disciplines and as experienced instructors, the participation of the faculty in the governance of the college is essential for the district’s pursuit of its mission. As professionals, the faculty have the right and a duty to set professional and ethical standards for the conduct of their profession and to promote the excellence of their profession. In order to achieve these ends and in accordance with Title 5 of the California Administrative Code, Subchapter 2, Sections 53200-53205, this Academic Senate is established.